North Central Regional Transit District
Board Meeting
Friday, April 1, 2011

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A regular monthly meeting of the North Central Regional Transit District Board was called to order on the above date by Chair Rosemary Romero at 1:00 p.m. at 101 Camino Entrada, Building 1 Conference Room, Los Alamos, New Mexico.

Mr. Dwyer said the Board had always considered a quorum as the number of voting units and they needed some resolution to the issue of number.

a. Pledge of Allegiance

b. Moment of Silence

c. Roll Call

Roll call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present:	Elected Members	Alternate Designees
Los Alamos County	Council Michael Wismer	Ms. Anne Laurent
Rio Arriba County	Commissioner Barney Trujillo	Mr. Tomás Campos
Taos County		
Santa Fé County		Ms. Penny Ellis-Green

Pojoaque Pueblo	Mr. Tim Vigil (telephonically)	
San Ildefonso Pueblo		
Ohkay Owingeh		
Santa Clara Pueblo		Ms. Mary Lou Quintana
Tesuque Pueblo		
City of Santa Fé	Councilor Rosemary Romero	Ms. Judith Amer
City of Española	Councilor Robert Seeds	
Members Absent:	**Elected Members**	**Alternate Designees**
Los Alamos County		
Taos County	Commissioner Dan Barrone	Mr. Jacob Caldwell
Santa Fé County	Commissioner Robert Anaya	
Pojoaque Pueblo		Councilman Cameron Martínez
San Ildefonso Pueblo	Councilman Raymond Martínez	Ms. Sandra Maes
Ohkay Owingeh	1st Lt. Gov. Virgil Cata	Ms. Kateri Keevama
Santa Clara Pueblo	Sheriff John Shije	
Tesuque Pueblo	Governor Charles Dorame	Vacant
City of Española		Councilor Helen Kane-Salazar

Chris Barela was on the bridge at the request of Commissioner Robert Anaya.

Staff Members Present
Ms. Josette Lucero, Executive Director
Mr. Jack Valencia, Transit Project Manager
Ms. Cynthia Halfar, Executive Assistant
Mr. Peter Dwyer, Counsel for NCRTD
Ms. Kelly Muniz, Financial Manager
Ms. Annette Velarde, Public Information Officer

Others Present
Mr. Andrew Jandàček, Santa Fé County
Mr. Bruce Poster, SW Planning and Marketing, Consultant
Mr. Antoine Broustra, SW Planning and Marketing, Consultant
Mr. Tony Mortillaro, Consultant

d. Introductions

Those present introduced themselves.

e. Public Comments Regarding Transportation Items or Issues

Chair Romero said some letters were received for the record. Anyone present with written comments could also submit them for the record.

About 8 people wanted to speak and Chair Romero allowed 2 minutes each.

Mr. Michael McKay, Los Alamos recalled that in 1981 a bunch of volunteers got together to start LA Bus with a commuter route to the lab. Some years later they got it really going. It was now a county-operated bus system. They wanted to keep the quality and grow it.

Mr. Ron Moses, Los Alamos, said he had been a user of LA Bus and Atomic City Transit now. He probably had the longest involvement of anyone. He was on the LA Bus board and then the transition board and now on the Transportation Board of Los Alamos County and Vice Chair. He was speaking on his own behalf.

He was concerned because he understood there was a possibility the RTD would try to pull back much of the funds Los Alamos was sent by the RTD. They sent about a million and Los Alamos had extended service to White Rock. Much would have to be discontinued if it was pulled back. It was important to note the great success of the Atomic City Transit system. It was a regional system and tied into the whole county and fed into the Park and Ride system. He needed public transportation and others voluntarily used it. It was very valuable and he didn't want to see it discontinued. He used Atomic City Transit, Park and Ride and some other systems in Santa Fé and it was very important to him.

Ms. Fran Berting, on the County Council but speaking on her own, said she was very concerned with the suggestions of changing the allocations from GRT. She was on the Council when the first discussion came out and they were discussing 1.8% GRT. Los Alamos County was to get 83% coming back and basically was the status quo they currently were in. She was advocating from the 4 options that the NCRTD remain with the status quo allocation.

The idea of having additional money of Option 3 returned to NCRTD after responses was not a good idea because the money hadn't been accounted for very well. They needed to look at the audit and keep the status quo so communities wouldn't suffer.

Mr. Campos arrived at this time.

Mr. Jonathan Hamilton said Los Alamos gave a gift of $5 million to the NCRTD that was paid over 5 years and now at the end of it there was suddenly a restructuring of money. The agreement was that Los Alamos would get 83%. Last year it was 53% and now the NCRTD wanted more money. The tax was to be

taken out for 15 years. Only a fraction of that money had been returned. Los Alamos wanted to be part of the regional system to tie all of northern New Mexico together. Mr. Mortillaro said in the Monitor that Los Alamos would get $560,000 back from NCRTD but that was not true.

He found it a strange coincidence that the new formula came at the end of the $5 million gift. So if Los Alamos didn't come up with more gift the NCRTD was just going to take the money from them in another way. He provided his written statement.

Mr. Dan Llewellen said the Atomic City Transit was an irreplaceable system. Many of his neighbors had the same situation as his. Any reduction in Atomic City Transit would be a detriment to him and his neighbors.

Mf. Greg Kendall said they had been warned that there might be a bait and switch and wanted to clarify that today.

Ms. Allison Leon said they used the bus system every day that it ran and it allowed them to have one car. They had another car in Wyoming but were managing with one here. The system here was exemplary and would be good for the NCRTD to fund fully.

Mr. James Lime from White Rock complimented these gentlemen who started the bus system. The system had been really good. He could remember one incident when there was a late snowstorm. His wife had taken the bus and if she had not she would have been trapped up here in Los Alamos. She was able to get home in White Rock.

Commissioner Trujillo arrived at this time.

Mr. Lime said the route 2 had been a real blessing to his family because they went to town every day and worked out and shopped and had doctor's appointments.

Mr. Didier Saumon from White Rock said he used the bus every day to go to work. It was a great project and very successful. Drivers were professional and routes were convenient and punctual. It aided in the quality of life in Los Alamos. He urged the Board to maintain the current level of service.

Mr. Tim Vigil joined the meeting telephonically.

Ms. Sandra Rodriguez said the service was warranted. She used it daily to go to work. In her job she could not always leave at 5:15 and the other routes allowed her to take the bus and not worry. A lot of families also used the after school bus routes. If those were cut it would be very difficult for her family.

Ms. Veronica Encinas, from White Rock, worked at the library. She used it every day and if it ran on Saturday she would take that too. Routes to White Rock were essential. When she got stuck helping patrons she didn't need to rush off and could take the next bus. There were two routes that went there. They didn't treat White Rock like a step-child. She wanted to see accountability.

Mr. Jonathan Niehof said Atomic City Transit was a fundamental part of our transportation. With less

funding we would end up with more cars and gas prices would take more money

Ms. Nashin Keshi said she ran one bus between the two mesas for ten years. She didn't want to see it reduced. Gas prices were getting higher. She wanted to see it increased on weekends so she wouldn't have to drive.

Ms. Elizabeth Jones lived in Los Alamos and worked in White Rock for the Lab and rode the bus a lot. She had planned to ride the bus today but had to take her car because the bus route didn't coordinate with this meeting. A route once per hour to White Rock was not enough. She urged them not to cut back on the routes. She was also concerned about the bait and switch. People were told when they voted for the GRT that it would increase the routes but it didn't. Taking away tax money they voted for one purpose and using it for another was not okay.

Ms. Rene Holaday lived in White Rock and worked in Los Alamos and rode to work several times per week and her kids rode the bus, especially in summer. It prevented kids from having to cross the street. They had taken kids on field trips and couldn't do these trips without Route 2. Having that facility was great for young ones and for the older folks on her block. It had become part of their lives and didn't want to lose it. She understood the increased GRT at LANL was a huge chunk. But they understood those funds would be spent on the Los Alamos transit system.

There were no other speakers from the public and the public comment section was closed.

Commissioner Trujillo and Mr. Campos introduced themselves.

Chair Romero said she was thrilled to be here. The GRT was a regional GRT and she knew that some folks didn't understand all of it. The Board would walk through it to help people understand the implications. There were a couple of presentations and hoped the public would stay for all of the meeting. They would go to a closed session at the end for personnel items.

2. ACTION ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/DISCUSSION:

A. Consideration of Resolution 2011-2: Adopting Rules Governing the Conduct of Board Meetings

Chair Romero reminded the Board this had come up a couple of times and they wanted to be transparent in the operations of the Board.

Councilor Wismer welcomed everyone to the community on behalf of Los Alamos County. He began by thanking Peter Dwyer and the Chair Romero for helping to put the resolution together.

Chair Romero apologized that she had not done the Roll Call yet.

Members present were Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Santa Fé County, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and City of Española.

Councilor Wismer read the resolution. They took what they felt was best from Robert's Rules of Order and adjusted it for the Board's best use. He walked through Option A first. They basically wrote these components of Option A to accord with the Open Meetings Act and necessary parts of Robert's Rules of Order. Then they checked them against the by-laws. The officers' duties were in the by-laws. Special meetings could be called by the Chair or 3 voting members. The guiding principles for meetings were designed to be user-friendly. The role of the Chair was to run the meeting and had final say in interpretation of the rules. But the Chair could be overturned by a majority of directors.

Subcommittees were free to adopt these rules or rules that would function for them.

He reviewed the Basic Flow for an action item. (Ten steps). If a discussion had altered the motion, the Chair could invite further public comment. Then the body would have discussion of the motion. After the vote, the Chair would announce the outcome of the vote.

He reviewed the types of motions and procedures for tabulating votes. Without the Chair and/or Vice Chair present no votes could be taken.

The Chair was responsible for courtesy and decorum and would recognize members before they spoke. Interruptions could be made for points of order or appeal of decisions for calling for the order of the day.

Option B called for public input at the beginning of the meeting and allowed it one time during the meeting.

Councilor Seeds asked Councilor Wismer about not allowing the public to interact on a motion. He asked if he could yield to a public member during discussion. He thought he should be able to do that.

Councilor Wismer said the difference was that Option A allowed for that public interaction - such as a comment on every item. With Option B the Board would only allow public comment at the beginning.

Mr. Vigil thought the explanation was well done.

Chair Romero said the Board might get direction today and take action next month. They had to do some research on this. As Councilor Wismer had noted, Option A was the Los Alamos County Council procedure. The City of Santa Fé did public comment at the beginning. Some groups left that to the end.

Her preference was for Option B to help with moving the meeting along.

Ms. Judith Amer arrived at this time.

Councilor Seeds wanted to take a little more time for considering the options but felt the public should be allowed to speak and interact with the Board to help in the decision making.

Councilor Wismer thanked him for that comment.

Councilor Wismer hoped the Board could approve either A or B and he had prepared a checklist for the chair to use today for either option.

Chair Romero said if they voted today it would be effective for the May meeting.

Chair Romero asked Mr. Dwyer if it would be best to approve the agenda before acting on this matter.

Mr. Dwyer preferred approving it first.

Mr. Dwyer commented that the request of Councilor Seeds abstention was listed here under tabulation of votes and #11. It said abstentions were neither in favor nor against.

On the specific point he raised about yielding the floor. There was no rule but in Option A, a member could present during the discussion.

Ms. Amer asked if someone abstained and that meant there was then not a quorum.

Mr. Dwyer said the quorum was determined by those present. The abstention was only to remove that person from voting; it didn't remove a quorum.

Chair Romero commented that sometimes at the end of the agenda the Board didn't have a quorum.

Mr. Dwyer said The Board lost a quorum it could no longer take action. That was Item 12 on page 9 of Option A. The only motion that could be made was a motion to adjourn and no further action could be done.

Councilor Wismer moved that the Board approve the Resolution 2011-02 according to Option A beginning in May 2011. Councilor Seeds seconded the motion.

Councilor Seeds thanked Councilor Wismer and Chair Romero for coming up with this procedure.

Chair Romero thanked Councilor Seeds for bringing the matter to the Board's attention.

Mr. Dwyer clarified that a voice vote was okay for this motion.

The motion to approve with Option A passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except the City of Santa Fé who voted against.

- **Approval of Agenda for April 1, 2011**

Councilor Seeds moved to approve the Agenda for April 1, 2011 as presented. Chair Romero seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- **Approval of Board Meeting Minutes**

December 3, 2010

Councilor Seeds noted that he did not attend that meeting but there were no issues for him.

Councilor Seeds moved to approve the minutes of December 3, 2010 as presented. Councilor Wismer seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

March 4, 2011

Councilor Wismer moved to approve the minutes of March 4, 2011 as presented. Commissioner Trujillo seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

B. Approval of Resolution 2011-03: Defining Regional Services for Purposes of NCRTD Decisions:

- **Memo from Josette Lucero and Basham and Basham dated June 4, 2010**

Ms. Lucero said during the last 6 months this issue had come up with a need to clarify it. The issue was defining regional and local transit services and the policy for how the Board would distribute funds throughout the district. The subcommittee had brought a definition and she read it in the resolution. (2011-03)

- **Draft from Sub-Group of Task Force dated December 2, 2010**

Ms. Lucero noted that the subcommittee agreed on these five definitions for what would constitute regional services. Staff recommended approval of this resolution.

Councilor Seeds asked what impact it would have, for instance, on Los Alamos County.

Ms. Lucero said they were not doing anything differently. The NCRTD currently used those definitions.

Councilor Wismer said they had lively substantive discussions on this topic at the subcommittee meetings.

Councilor Seeds moved to approve the resolution as recommended by staff. Ms. Quintana seconded the motion.

Mr. Dwyer suggested that in preparation for the future, it would be best to have a roll call vote and have Ms. Halfar announce who voted in favor and who voted against and might want to announce both the simple majority and weighted results.

The motion passed by unanimous roll call voted with Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Santa Fé County, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and City of Española voting in favor and none voting against (21 voting units).

Chair Romero thanked the subcommittee for all of their hard work. Taos County also worked hard on it.

3. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Chair Romero said these were not action items today but as education for the Board.

C. Funding Allocation

Ms. Lucero said this item had been under preparation since last June. Mr. Mortillaro was part of the subcommittee at that time and she asked him to be present to help with it today.

They brought three options to the Taos meeting and add the status quo as the fourth option. They hoped to move some of these options back to the subcommittee. The new information for this meeting was a longer term ten-year plan and what that had to do with the number of organizations and the district. They would work on it further at the subcommittee meeting on April 15th and then bring a final recommendation to the next board meeting on May 6.

Chair Romero clarified that the subcommittee meetings were open to all board members. This had been an intentional process to look out for the health of the organization for the next decade and the shifting of GRT revenues, etc. They wanted to understand the ramifications of their thinking.

Mr. Mortillaro said they had been discussing this since May 2010 along with the definition of regional transit services.

They also discussed that this was a regional transit system but bifurcated as they took over services in Española and Rio Arriba County and those operation modes and began providing in Taos County. They also provided support for Santa Fé and Los Alamos transit systems. So it was not like traditional regional systems where one entity provided it all. It led to some parochialism and could affect the budget on specific line items.

The GRT collected tax for NCRTD by each county was then sent to NCRTD. Then NCRTD distributed out of that pool to the transit entities. The funding mechanism was in 3.21.11.

Option 1 was simply an average cost as described with the average cost factors.
Option 2 would allocate based on revenue in the various counties based on a per capita basis.

Option 3 was based on per capita revenue and vehicle fixed costs.

Option 4 was the status quo.

Mr. Mortillaro suggested not to look at this solely as a cost allocation method but a long range plan for the district. He showed some graphs based on those fund allocations which involved some projections. Changes were factored in.

Chair Romero explained that as a new organization, the projections were very conservative for the budget. Now they were looking forward, based on their experience, and felt this was a good estimate of what was possible.

Mr. Mortillaro had been involved since before Ms. Lucero was hired six years ago. So what was what would be in the future and how they would look strategically at the next ten years. It had implications on the membership and even outside our jurisdiction. The economic recession forced some critical decisions on transit and public safety. Some communities were even cutting police and fire.

He showed the charts in a power point presentation and described long term financial scenarios (A, B, C). Within each of them they took each of the cost allocation methods to see what effect it would have. The Los Alamos funding would go away in 2012 in which year the final payment would be received.

They looked at cost increases of about 3% per year. The projection was a deficit. The Board's policy was to keep 25% in reserve. The DFA required 1/8 in reserve. The challenge was how to get the blue line up to the red line.

Under Option 2 it didn't look much different.

Under Option 3 it looked much better. Revenues and expenses were close to each other and the reserve requirement was maintained. So financially, option 3 would be best for the district.

They did build the CMRR into this (new construction project at the LANL). That would bring in new revenue but it was not expected to start until 2013.

Chair Romero clarified that CMRR was another lab building that would increase federal monies coming into Los Alamos.

Councilor Wismer said it was one of the largest items in the President's budget - a plutonium facility costing over a billion dollars.

Mr. Mortillaro added that it was one time revenue with no more revenue after it was built. So they didn't add routes with that money.

Scenario B - option 1 took out $4 million for a phase 2 maintenance facility. This was an ultraconservative scenario. Revenues didn't meet expenses and the reserve would go away. Option 2 was very similar to option 1.

Under Option 3 it wouldn't build the reserve until about 2015.

With the status quo under scenario C the revenue wouldn't meet expenses. No CMRR was built in. There would be a negative impact and the reserve would disappear. It had the phase 2 maintenance facility in it for about $900,000 and that could be removed to bring the ending reserve amount up.

Option 4 with CMRR using the status quo would be about the same.

The last one was status quo with CMRR retained by RTD. It would allow 86% to Santa Fé and 83% to Los Alamos but without allocating CMRR. It would keep revenues and expenses aligned and preserve the reserve balance. But they would hang their hat on CMRR.

The District took the revenue generated by the counties and programmed it into delivery routes and projected receiving $8 million in GRT but that did not materialize. No one knew when the counties would recover. There were increased costs for things like gasoline and demands for increased services. When gasoline went up, transit ridership went up.

So on the final draft of financial plan the Board could determine if it wanted to change it or keep the status quo.

Councilor Seeds believed this clarified what they were talking about.

Councilor Wismer apologized if he led the public to believe a decision would be made here today. But he was glad the public was here and delivered their comments. He kept chipping away at the three models and Commissioner Trujillo asked previously what Los Alamos wanted. He responded that Los Alamos just wanted to be treated fairly.

They had two routes connected with RTD and designed to be funded by RTD. They believed that fairness was the ability of RTD to fund those two routes. He would have a recommendation for the subcommittee.

Chair Romero asked if that would be considered at the subcommittee.

Councilor Wismer agreed but wanted to distribute it today. He had not thought through the implications until recently. He would like it to be given consideration at the subcommittee.

He referred to it as a simplification of the document put together by the consultant. It needed to be clear where the money was going. Consolidate it into one pool and distribute based on the regional routes. Los Alamos had two regional routes. Each of the scenarios would not fund those routes. The underlying assumptions in them were questionable. But their model might not be reliable and their systems were not as complex as they ought to be. There were 16 deficiencies on the audit and they were one year behind in it. If he had 16 repeat offenses he would be shown the door. 10 of those were material and some were substantial.

The real issue was that the RTD was not ready for a complicated model and needed to fix it. His concern for the future was that the money to fund the Los Alamos routes was now being taken back.

What he was asking for was a consistent model that members could plan for and budget on. The models presented didn't do that. There was no consistent rationale for the budget.

He would like an alternative method that would allow funding for approved routes and was simple and easy to understand. Los Alamos would prefer a percentage basis and freedom to use those to cover the costs.

He submitted a substitute provision for deliberation by the subcommittee

Chair Romero promised to get it to Mr. Vigil.

Councilor Wismer explained that in the handout Santa Fé County's and City's methodology would remain the same with the Rail Runner continuing to receive 50%. The same would be true for Taos and Rio Arriba. Los Alamos would like same percentage of the GRT regardless of what the revenue was and would be able to cover their two routes.

Chair Romero said this would be considered and they would have other discussions on it.

Ms. Amer said she was hearing that with Mr. Mortillaro's numbers it would be a substantial reduction.

Councilor Wismer said the status quo didn't consider a consolidated but he believed you could use these numbers.

Ms. Amer was trying to understand how this alternative differed from the status quo. They wanted percentages.

Councilor Wismer said he was shooting for consistent rate of return. To consolidate the budget it was best to use percentages.

D. Update of the Jim West Regional Transit Center

Ms. Lucero said staff went out to the Center yesterday. Construction was underway and November was the estimated completion date. They gutted some of the plumbing inside and were doing work on windows outside so it was underway and they were on track.

Mr. Dwyer said there was no pending litigation.

E. Tribal Subcommittee Report

Chair Romero urged the tribal subcommittee to look at the allocation proposal and discuss it.

Mr. Valencia highlighted the meeting from their minutes. There were three new bus shelters in Tesuque Pueblo and they were working to enhance their allocation. They discussed local vs regional transit. They also talked about the cost allocation as Mr. Mortillaro brought up. Tribes had multiple funds (listed) to put

together a cohesive budget. Lastly, Mr. Guillen discussed an anticipated meeting with Pojoaque Pueblo Governor and Chair Romero which did happen.

Chair Romero asked Mr. Vigil to highlight that meeting.

Mr. Vigil said they wanted to meet with Governor Rivera on issues at RTD and what impact the decisions would have on pueblo members. They were pleased that the pueblos had taken an active role in the RTD and hoped to keep the lines of communication open with RTD.

Chair Romero explained that each tribe addressed the grant making in a different way. In Pojoaque Pueblo's case the RTD staff had written most of them. There would be fewer tribal dollars in the future so they were keeping an eye on that.

Mr. Valencia said this past year Pojoaque Pueblo wrote their own grant. The only one staff helped with was with Tesuque. The rest wrote their own.

Chair Romero said the offer was always there to help them with the grants.

F. Finance/Regional Coordination & Consolidation Subcommittee Report

Chair Romero said she called in for the meeting. Councilor Wismer, Commissioner Trujillo and Commissioner Anaya were present and agreed to move forward.

Ms. Lucero said the funding options were discussed and they got rid of the original Option 4 and replaced it with status quo. The discussion would resume on April 15 and hopefully the Board could decide on May 6th.

Chair Romero thought maybe they could have the next board meeting at Pojoaque Pueblo. They had been gracious about that.

G. Executive Report for March 2011

Ms. Lucero referred the Board to the report in the packet and shared the accomplishments for the month.

H. NCRTD Ridership Report for February 2011

Ms. Lucero said staff sent the report out electronically and it was not in the packet. Ridership continued to go up.

I. Budget & Expenditure Report and Status of 2009 Audit

Ms. Muniz said the 2009 audit was a final audit. She asked if the Board would like for her to invite the auditor to the next board meeting.

Chair Romero said yes.

Ms. Muniz reported there were a lot of findings. Last meeting she had explained where some of them came from. In 2006 the City of Santa Fé was the fiscal agent and the audit was late. In 2007 the City of Santa Fé was still the fiscal agent. NCRTD was not taken care of because the audit was late again that year.

The NCRTD had only one financial staff member trying to do everything and didn't get a second one until mid 2010 and converted from Quik Books to MIP at that time. Everything was where it should be now for separation of duties. The 2010 audit should start next week after the State Auditor approved. It would hopefully be done by July 31. They had the staff now and a system and were creating the procedures and policy they didn't have before. Some of the findings would go away in 2010 and the rest should go away in 2011.

Ms. Lucero clarified that some of the findings were just separation of duties.

Ms. Muniz said a lot of them were that. There were not enough people to take care of separating the duties.

Chair Romero said they would invite the auditor to the May meeting. She also offered for Ms. Kathryn Raveling to come talk to the fiscal agency with the City of Santa Fé.

Councilor Wismer said he underlined those parts as he read through the audit for what needed to be done to get them addressed. He felt they were not where they needed to be yet but had confidence that it would happen. It should be done in the new system as it matured.

Ms. Muniz went through the GRT and Budget reports. They had 69% of GRT revenue and the budget was at 75%.

Chair Romero - asked her to comment on the handout from the public.

Councilor Wismer wasn't sure who passed it out but it was one side of what had been presented to Los Alamos Council to get their original support for the GRT ballot initiative - the implication was an 83% allocation.

Ms. Lucero said it was given to all the county commissions on projections on GRT at that time but wasn't passed at that point in time. It included federal funds as well.

Mr. Valencia explained that there was a lot of action between June and September with various resolutions that impacted the slide.

He had the brochures that were highlighted in the four counties. There was only one county reflected in

the resolution that demonstrated any allocation of monies (Santa Fé). Santa Fé at that point was vacillating on membership. It was the service plan extracted from Santa Fé that was in the brochure. The email in September of that year was before they printed 125,000 of them. They had communicated with all of the entities. The Los Alamos County staff provided these items in September of that year that provided those projects.

Councilor Wismer said they discussed that on Tuesday last week. Even though these were back in 2008, there were members who were on at that time and that was the perception. Some of what was projected was service plans.

Ms. Muniz went to the budget and said they were about 75% through the year. The revenue was about 61% because construction hadn't started so the revenue would come back up. Administrative expense was about 65% (less than the 75% budget) so they were looking closely at spending. Capital would start to increase but hadn't yet had invoices flowing in on that.

J. Matters from the Executive Director

Ms. Lucero passed around the brochure for the New Mexico Transit Association conference on April 17th at Buffalo Thunder. The NCRTD would register anyone interested in attending. It was good training for board members. NCRTD drivers had taken first place for last two years and second place in nationals.

Chair Romero said if you Google the NCRTD, the list was significant on the number of awards they had garnered. Driver performance had been stellar at national.

Secondly, Ms. Lucero announced her retirement and asked the Board to accept it. She wanted to spend time with her daughter.

Chair Romero read the letter and commented that most of the Board knew she had been eligible for retirement for about a year.

Chair Romero reminded the Board that at this time last year she spoke of the need for succession planning. The Board would discuss that in closed session.

Councilor Wismer told Ms. Lucero he thought Jim West would say "you got it done."

Ms. Lucero wished the Board the best of luck.

K. Closed Session: Succession Plan for Executive Director

Councilor Wismer moved to go into executive closed session pursuant to NMSA 1978 § 10-15-1.H (2) to discuss limited personnel matters. Councilor Seeds seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous roll call vote with Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Santa Fé County, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and City of Española voting in favor and none voting

against.

The Board went into closed session at 3:30 p.m.

The Board returned to open session at 4:26 p.m. upon a motion by Councilor Seeds and seconded by Councilor Wismer and passed by roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and City of Española voting in favor and none against. Santa Fé County and Pojoaque Pueblo were not present for the vote.

Because there was a question about still having a quorum, Mr. Tim Vigil was contacted and joined the bridge.

L. Action: Approval of Recommendations Discussed in Closed Session

Councilor Wismer moved that the Board reluctantly accept the resignation of Josette Lucero as Executive Director, direct staff to accomplish the contract with Southwest Planning and Marketing and appoint a committee for selection of a new Executive Director composed of Chair Romero, Commissioner Trujillo, Councilor Seeds, Mr. Tim Vigil and Mr. Jacob Caldwell. Councilor Seeds seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and City of Española voting in favor and none voting against.

4. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

There were no matters from the Board.

5. MISCELLANEOUS

There were no miscellaneous items.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Board was scheduled for May 6, 2011 at 1:00 p.m. at a location yet to be determined.

Councilor Wismer moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilor Seeds seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Approved by:

Rosemary Romero, Chair

Submitted by:

Carl Boaz, Stenographer

Attest:

Michael Wismer, Secretary